



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/786,844 | 02/25/2004 | John Douglas Method | BEAS-1438US1 | 2952 |
| 23910 7590 02/11/2008 FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108 | | | | |
| EXAMINER KEATON, SHERROD L | | | | |
| ART UNIT 2174 | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| MAIL DATE 02/11/2008 | | DELIVERY MODE PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/786,844

Applicant(s)

METHOT, JOHN DOUGLAS

Examiner

Sherrod Keaton

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11-26-07.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 9, 12, 15-18 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 9, 12, 15-18 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the filing on 11-26-07. Claims 2-8, 10-11, 13-14, 19 have been canceled and Claims 1, 9, 12, 15-18, 20-22 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 9, 12, 15-18, 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US 2003/0028364 A1) in view of Sullivan (US 20030016238 A1), Chong (US 20020184610 A1) and Cohen (US 7024658 B1).

Claim 1: Chan discloses a method for extending online help, comprising:

Art Unit: 2174

processing documentation content upon import of the integrated development environment extension wherein the documentation content includes context sensitive help topics (Page 1, Paragraph 5);

but does not explicitly disclose

displaying operations for a help system wherein search capabilities and table of contents are automatically updated after the integrated development environment extension is imported.

However Sullivan discloses a context based help engine and dynamic help and further discloses displaying updated help topics to user when context has changed (Page 7, Paragraph 73).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have updates of help topics when an extension is added in Chan as taught by Sullivan. One would have been motivated to update the help system because it allows user to conduct thorough queries improving user efficiency.

Nor does Chan explicitly disclose that the documentation content can support delivery of help for a particular component in a single archive file and the file being a JAR file. However Chong discloses a system and method for building multi-modal and channel applications and further discloses an extension being a single archive file and the archive file being a JAR file (Page 30, Paragraph 436). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have an archive JAR file in the modified Chan as taught by Chong. One would have been motivated to have a single archive file instead of having to save a series of files with the extensions, which improves efficiency.

Chan also does not explicitly disclose the help display being configured to display content in a web browser. However Cohen discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system being configured to display content in a web browser (Column 2, Lines 3-13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to display content in a web browser of the modified Chan as taught by Cohen. One would have been motivated to include the help display content in a web browser in order to allow user access multiple help files through hyperlinked pages.

Cohen also discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system with control and control properties (Column 2, Lines 3-13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include control and control properties in the modified Chan as taught by Cohen. One would have been motivated to include control and control properties to allow user to generate multiple help files aimed at specific files.

Claim 9: Chan, Sullivan, Chong and Cohen disclose an extension as an IDE extension as in Claim 2 above and further discloses that the help system can be integrated with an extension installation mechanism (Chan Page 2, Paragraph 15-16).

Claim 12: Chan, Sullivan, Chong and Cohen disclose an extension as an IDE extension as in Claim 2 above and Cohen further discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system being externally controllable (Column 3, Lines 5-20).

Claim 15: Chan, Sullivan, Chong and Cohen disclose a help system including context-sensitive help topics as in Claim 1 above and further disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID (Chan Page 7, Paragraph 60-61).

Claim 16: Chan, Sullivan, Chong and Cohen disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID as in Claim 10 above and further disclose the context ID is a fully qualified Java class (Chan Page 1 Paragraph 6-8).

Claim 17: Chan, Sullivan, Chong and Cohen disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID as in Claim 10 above and further disclose the context ID is a fully qualified name from a non-Java resource (Chan Page 1 Paragraph 6-8).

Claim 18: Chan, Sullivan, Chong and Cohen disclose a method as in claim 1 above wherein the documentation content is in HTML or XML format (Chan Page 3, Paragraph 25).

Claim 20: Chan, Sullivan, Chong and Cohen disclose a method as in Claim 1 above and Chong further discloses the file being a JAR file (Page 30, Paragraph 436).

Claim 21: Chan, Sullivan, Chong and Cohen disclose a method as in Claim 1 above wherein the IDE widgets, controls, and control properties are associated with the documentation topics that can be automatically displayed in the help system when requested by a user performing a context sensitive help gesture (Chan Figure 2; 20). The widgets are provided when using the help system.

3. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US 2003/0028364 A1), Sullivan (US 20030016238 A1), Chong (US 20020184610 A1) and Cohen (US 7024658 B1) as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of Huboi et al ("Huboi" US 6799198 B1).

Claim 22: Chan, Sullivan, Chong and Cohen disclose the method of claim 1 but is not explicitly disclosed wherein a control is installed, documentation for the control can be integrated with the help system during the installation of the control. However Huboi discloses installation of a control (button) and corresponding documentation for a help system (Column 13, Line 39-

Column 14, Line 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention provide documentation and control installation to a help system in the modified Chan as taught by Huboi. One would have been motivated to provide these installations to provide a help system with better operability and functionality.

Response to Arguments

Argument Claim 1: Applicants arguments have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicants argue delivery of help in Chong. Chong allows the information (file) to be used by the user. It is obvious that this file can contain help information, set up information, any type of information. Therefore in combination with the other prior art the information that is supplied is the updated help topics for a particular component or subject.

Conclusion

4. Applicants amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DAVE WILEY can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access

Art Unit: 2174

to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

1-31-08

/David A Wiley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174